

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

AGENDA

The next meeting of the
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)
will be as follows.

Date: Thursday, August 25, 2011
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Place: San Mateo City Hall
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, California
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL TOM MADALENA (599-1460) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|--------------|
| 1. | Call To Order | Action (Grocott) | |
| 2. | Pledge of Allegiance | (Grocott) | |
| 3. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda | Presentations are limited to 3 minutes per speaker. | |
| 4. | Minutes of the July 28, 2011 Meeting | Action (Grocott) | Pages 1-4 |
| 5. | Review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan | Action (Hoang) | Pages 5-19 |
| 6. | Executive Director Report | Information (Napier) | |
| | A. Discussion on Future Call For Projects | Action (Napier) | No materials |
| | B. Review and Recommendation on Improvements to the Call for Projects for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program | Action (Napier) | Pages 20-30 |
| 7. | Member Communications | Information (Grocott) | |
| 8. | Adjournment | Action (Grocott) | |

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

Other enclosures/Correspondence

- None.

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Richard Napier at 650-599-1420 or Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460.

NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

The following BPAC meeting will be held on Thursday October 27th, 2011.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
July 28, 2011

1. Call to Order

Chair Grocott called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

Members Present:

Karyl Matsumoto, Ken Ibarra, Judi Mosqueda, David Alfano, Naomi Patridge Cory Roay, Paul Grantham, Frank Markowitz, Steve Schmidt, Marge Colapietro, Cathleen Baker

Members Absent:

Ian Bain, Cathy Baylock

Staff/Guests Attending:

Sandy Wong, Tom Madalena, John Hoang, Pat Giorni, Mike Harding, Kenneth Chin, Tim O'Brien, Colin Hayne, Al Meckler, Andrew Boone, Susan Wheeler

3. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda

None.

4. Minutes of May 26, 2011 Meeting

Motion: Member Alfano moved/Member Schmidt seconded approval of the May 26, 2011 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Recommend approval of the Final Project List for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for FY 2012 & FY 2013

John Hoang, C/CAG staff, presented this item as a continuation from the last meeting. The report included the recommended project list for the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program and a summary of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) recommended project list. John stated that the TA took their list to their Board of Directors and added approximately 1.5 million to make their program include 16 projects for over 4.5 million of funding. Staff requested that the BPAC approve the 7 projects for 1.1 million as stated in the staff report.

Member Matsumoto mentioned that the 1.5 million from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) comes off of the next cycle of Measure A. It was not a gift.

Member Schmidt asked if there were minutes from the reconciliation meeting for the public. John Hoang stated that there were no minutes.

Member Matsumoto mentioned that the process was flawed and that she was uncomfortable with

how it went at the TA.

Member Alfano asked if we are here to approve “this” list or “a” list. Chair Grocott stated “a” list.

Member Baker stated that she doesn’t have a terrible problem fundamentally since we hit about 90% of our population. There is a process issue that affects approving the final list.

Member Mosqueda asked that did we not have the opportunity to approve our list at the last meeting. That was the opportunity to take control of the process.

Member Markowitz mentioned that he thought that the process could be discussed for next time.

Member Colapietro pointed out that Alpine Road is a safety project versus Crystal Springs which is a recreational project.

Member Roay stated that there is quite a bit of subjectivity in the process.

Member Markowitz thinks that the project proponents would argue that both Crystal Springs and Alpine Road are safety projects but Alpine Road serves a larger need.

Member Schmidt motioned and member Roay seconded to have the list recommended for approval as is with the exception of moving the Alpine Road resurfacing project to a full funding position and drop the Crystal Springs project to the remainder of the TDA funding. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Review and Recommendation on Improvements to the Joint Call for Projects for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

John Hoang, C/CAG staff, presented this item and mentioned that the scoring sheet and application packet were based on what the C/CAG BPAC had used in the previous cycle. He stated that there is a meeting with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) to discuss the process with input from the meeting tonight.

Member Alfano asked if the application and score sheet have change and the answer was no. Member Alfano said that he did not remember the non-supplantation of funds item. John Hoang stated that was something that the TA applies to all of the Measure A programs.

Member Ibarra asked is there a way in the application and scoring sheet where it eliminates those projects that don’t qualify for TA or TDA Article 3? John stated that we could definitely put criteria in there.

Member Baker asked if staff has decided to go forward with another joint call for projects and staff said no.

Colin Hayne, member of the public from the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, made a statement that they developed with several members from San Mateo County regarding their concerns with this recent process and handed staff a letter from the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

Andrew Boone, member of the public, thinks that the problem is greater than how you decide on

funds. It would work better if the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) had a bicycle committee. The C/CAG BPAC could be the committee for both agencies or the TA could create their own.

Mike Harding, member of the public, talked about a list of possible fixes for funding distribution which is that BPAC do all ranking for both TDA and TA funds. However if changes are not politically feasible there could be an arithmetic solution which includes weighted scores bases on the numbers on each committee. This arithmetic way would take away geographic and political issues.

Pat Giorni, member of the public, thinks the big problem is that people don't understand how the process works in San Mateo County. She would suggest that the place to start at the TA would be for them to start a BPAC.

Member Alfano stated that the preference of funds allows the sponsor to specify which funds were preferred and then BPAC could only review and look at those in the BPAC queue. He stated that he wants it to say source of funds not preference of funds.

Member Baker recommended creating a subcommittee or working group with staff from both agencies.

Member Matsumoto proposes a joint call, joint presentation and joint site visits. The scoring is where it breaks off as each would do scoring separately.

Member Patridge thinks the criteria is just drastically too different between the two agencies. She stated that she did not want to do the joint call again.

Member Baker was bothered by the TA Citizens Advisory Committee comments about narrowing the sidewalk. It does not serve the people who need to not choose to bike or walk.

Member Schmidt thinks that the three percent Measure A money should be decided by the BPAC. The C/CAG BPAC should be the BPAC for the TA.

Member Mosqueda did not care for the combined process and is concerned that if we ask project sponsors to choose a funding source most will choose TA as they have much more money.

Item 6 was tabled to be continued at the August meeting.

7. Update on the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

John Hoang gave a verbal update and stated the release date will be before the next meeting in August.

Member Alfano asked what is driving the schedule and John stated that we want to wrap up the project.

8. Presentation on the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) Bicycle Plan

Niko Letunic, consultant from Eisen/Letunic, presented this item on the BART Bicycle Plan. There are two fairly significant changes to the scope of the plan. It creates a second scope which is to make

recommendations on access to BART stations. They have done extensive public outreach and they issued a survey with 4500 respondents. He asked for input on recommendations on the plan and stated that the BPAC could email comments to kevin@eisenletunic.com. They would like input on three items. The first is bike access to BART stations. The second is bike access within BART stations and the third is general system wide improvements.

Member Grantham commented that there is almost zero signage around BART stations for bikes.

Pat Giorni, member of the public, stated she had emailed the consultants about bikes on board. Bikes on board can be considered in the plan since it is an existing condition. She thinks they should have public members on the BART Bike Plan Technical Advisory Committee.

Andrew Boone, member of the public, commented that bikes on board should be studied again. He acknowledged that folding bikes are allowed at all times.

9. Member Communications

None

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 pm.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 25, 2011
To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
From: John Hoang
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the BPAC review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

FISCAL IMPACT / SOURCE OF FUNDS

\$200,000 / TDA Art. 3, Measure A

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The goal of the new San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) project is to update the previous bicycle plan and expand the document to include a new pedestrian component with countywide significance. This project update status is the sixth provided to the BPAC. The meetings, which are summarized below, allow the BPAC the opportunity to provide input at key stages in the CBPP development process.

<u>BPAC Meeting</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
July 22, 2010	Draft Policy Framework and plan elements
August 26, 2010	Final Policy Framework, existing pedestrian conditions, methodology for developing pedestrian focus area and refining bicycle network
October 28, 2010	Draft Countywide Bikeway Network (CBN) and pedestrian improvement typologies
January 27, 2011	Recommend CBN and pedestrian focus areas
February 24, 2011	Release draft CBPP for public review

CBPP Outreach

During the initial phase of the CBPP development process, beginning in July 2010, the 20 cities and County were asked to complete a survey indicating the state of bicycle and pedestrian projects within each respective jurisdiction. As needed, follow-up interviews and meetings were held with jurisdictions. As part of the process, the C/CAG BPAC has been relied upon to provide input and guidance towards the development of the CBPP over the course of five meetings, the most recent meeting being on February 24, 2011.

A Public Open House was held in October 2010 to allow members of the public, bicycle advocacy groups, and local agency staff to review and discuss the Countywide Bikeway Network (CBN), pedestrian demand analyses and improvement needs, and the vision/goals/policies. Additional input (e-mails and letters) was received from individuals and bicycle advocacy groups.

Administrative Draft CBPP

All the comments received from the outreach efforts indicated above were taken into consideration in the development of the Administrative Draft CBPP. The purpose of the Admin Draft, which was only distributed to the 20 cities and County in January 2011, was to provide the jurisdictions (project sponsors) the opportunity to review the document and make the necessary revisions prior to generating the Draft CBPP that would be made available to the public.

Draft CBPP for Public Review

The Draft CBPP (Main Report, Appendices, and accompanying Resource Guide) was released on February 24, 2011 for public review and comments. A downloadable version of the Draft CBPP was also posted on the project website. Comments were due on April 15, 2011. We continued to receive comments through June.

C/CAG received over 170 individual comments from 36 individuals, local jurisdictions, and groups including the following: Cities of San Mateo, East Palo Alto, Half Moon Bay, Millbrae, Redwood City, San Bruno, South San Francisco; County of San Mateo (Health System and Public Works); Caltrans; Metropolitan Transportation Commission; SamTrans; Mid Coast Community Council; Sierra Club; Bike San Mateo County; Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition; Group of 19 bicyclists; and 14 individual public members.

Most of the comments focused on modifications to the proposed County Bikeway Network (CBN), refinements to the Bicycle Key Corridors and Pedestrian Focus Areas definitions, and enhancement to information contained in the document.

A meeting was held on June 23, 2011 with local advocacy groups that provided comments to recapitulate key issues and concerns. C/CAG provided the approach to addressing comments.

Finalizing the CBPP

Over the past several months C/CAG has incorporated comments, as appropriate, to finalize the CBPP (attached). A CBPP comments list will also be made available in conjunction with the release of the final CBPP. With the BPAC's recommendation to approve, the Draft Final CBPP will be presented to the C/CAG Board for adoption at its September 8, 2011 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft Final San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and Appendix
- Comments to the CBPP
- Resource Guide (available in electronic format only)

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
1	3/5/2011	Paul Grantham	I would like point out an error on the Countywide Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan you handed out at the last BPAC meeting: On figure B-5, lower Hillside drive is shown as an "existing Class II bike path". In fact, it is a Class I bike path. I have only a couple of bike route signs but not striped bike lane, upper Hillside drive is shown as an "existing Class I bike path". In fact, has no signage in that section, so I think it should be shown as "Unclassified on street". I live on street and ride it daily. It would indeed be wonderful if these routes existed...hopefully in the future. Thanks for all your work to provide us with better biking and walking facilities.	Map amended to show all of Hillside Drive as a bike route.
2	3/7/2011	Connie Sadler, RWC	As someone who commutes by bicycle daily from Redwood City to Palo Alto (I work at Stanford), I can tell you that there are several very dangerous areas that need to be addressed. One in particular needs to be called out. The stretch of road along East Bayshore Road between Haven and Woodside Road is quite dangerous because of the volume of speeding traffic along that stretch, and the lack of a bike lane, particularly in the southbound direction. There is a lot of bike traffic along this route, and there is a serious need for improvement there. There really is no alternative to taking that route for those headed to the bike path south of Marsh Road, and very little space. I thought it was worth mentioning as the county looks at potential "hot spots".	No change. This segment is proposed in the plan as unclassified on-street.
3	3/7/2011	Oliver Bock	I ride a fair amount and as you know, it is difficult to find safe routes to get north and south or east and west. I ride from Woodside and have been using Redwood Ave, which runs parallel to Woodside Road to get to downtown. It works pretty well. IT would work even better if it was a bike route or bike boulevard. It is a lot wider than Oak and not as busy. White paint and bike signs would make it a much nicer route. As far as north south, the best I have found between Redwood City and Palo Alto, (I generally don't go north from Redwood City), winds through the Fair Oaks neighborhood and ends up on Bay Road. I then cut up to Coleman and cross into Palo Alto on the Chaucer ST. bridge. Bike lanes on busy roads like Middlefield and El Camino may seem like a good idea but I don't like the traffic or the fumes from the vehicles. It also feels more dangerous to be on busy roads. I hope this is helpful and I'd be happy to provide more input either by email or in person. By the way, I ride an electric bike which increases my range and in my opinion turns a bike into a very functional form of transportation. Especially as gas prices soar.	Redwood Avenue: City doesn't identify this as bikeway in Circ Element, but does indicate Roosevelt Ave, a parallel route as class II or III. Added Roosevelt Avenue. NS Route: Not enough specific info to add it in, but we do show a lot of low-volume streets in atherton/menlo park connecting to santa clara county.
4	3/9/2011	Sean Co	I am in the process of reviewing the plan and it does not look like there is a section on description of citizen involvement. This may be added in the final document but I don't see it in this version. Please review to the attached checklist to see all the BTA requirements.	Public Outreach is already summarized in section 6.3.2. Added "Outreach" section to Executive Summary.
5	3/9/2011	Manny Gabet	I just read the bike plan and wanted to add my comment. I have been a bike commuter for over 20 years and, although I appreciate your efforts, my opinion is that the bike plan is weak and will have a negligible effect on increasing bike commuting. One of the main barriers keeping others from bike commuting is the danger from distracted and speeding drivers and the best way to protect cyclists is to have a physical separation between their lanes and the traffic, even if it's just a low ridge that would alert drivers that they're veering into the bike lanes. I was also disappointed to see that there weren't any bike boulevards proposed. Anyways, my 2 cents.	Added new sub-section to Section 6.2: "Designing for Bicyclists of All Abilities." Referenced NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide. Added language regarding identifying bicycle boulevards as alternative routes to CBN. Section already refers to resource guide. Suggested low barrier described in comment not a recommended design.
5a	3/10/2011	Manny Gabet	I appreciate the response and thank you for your time. My concern was that it makes more sense to plan the bike boulevards and separations at the county level to have a truly integrated bike network, otherwise it is just a patchwork of discontinuous corridors. I have been to other U.S. cities and countries that have well integrated bike networks where the cyclists are physically separated from traffic and the number of people who use them to get around on their bikes is amazing. In Denmark, for example, 20% of adults use their bikes to get to work and school.	See response to comment 5. Bike boulevards are best implemented at a local level, due to level of detail and local knowledge required to identify alignments.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
6	3/14/2011	Brent Butler, City of East Palo Alto	Please accept this additional information, which was not submitted with the material previously provided. This outlines the City's adopted Bikeway Plan, C-5 of the Circulation Element. The maps in the draft San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) should be amended to include the City's adopted Bikeway Plan that is part of the 1999 General Plan, which has not yet been amended. (Attached map)	Bikeways on Bay Road and Newbridge Street have been classified according to the General Plan.
7	3/20/2011	Margaret Pye, San Carlos resident	I feel very strongly that this plan needs to allow for a continuous bikeway along Middlefield Rd from the town of Atherton to Woodside Road. I use that route by bicycle quite frequently. It is the most sensible and direct route. Please do not allow the detour (5th/ Bay/ Charter) to remain in the plan. It is embarrassing to imagine that this detour would be considered a useful bikeway for the majority of bicyclists in San Mateo County. Middlefield Rd in the Fair Oaks area is used by many bicyclists and pedestrians-- you need to acknowledge that fact by making it part of the official plan, so that any deficits in safety or convenience in that neighborhood can be rectified, not ignored and circumvented. Thank you for considering my (strong) opinion in this regard.	Middlefield road in Fair Oaks added to CBN.
8	3/21/2011	Robert Weil, San Carlos PWD	One of our Transportation Commissioners noticed something I didn't in the latest draft of the plan. On page A-2, there's a reference to a \$7,000 project described as "San Carlos Ave from Elm St to Skyway Road, 0.89 miles." The limits of this project should be changed to San Carlos Avenue from Elm Street to El Camino Real. It can remain a Class III facility. This would be consistent with the draft Bicycle Transportation Plan for San Carlos, which describes the following project: Improved Access to San Carlos Train Station. A Transit Village is planned for vacant land in the vicinity of the San Carlos Train Station. As part of the Transit Village project, the existing intersection of San Carlos Avenue and El Camino Real will be modified to remove the east leg of the intersection. Motorized vehicles will access rail station parking from a new intersection at Cherry Street and El Camino Real. Other changes are being considered to San Carlos Avenue and Laurel Street in the vicinity of the train station on both sides. As part of these changes, bicycle access should be improved to the extent possible. It is imperative that this design include provision for improving bicycle access on San Carlos Avenue between Elm St. and El Camino Real.	Maps identify segment from Elm to El Camino Real. Revised Appendix A tables to reflect this.
9	3/27/2011	VK Jones, Redwood City resident	I'm responding to the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle Plan. We live near the Lakeview Way and Jefferson intersection in Redwood City/Emerald Hills. We have two comments: 1. There are no sidewalks on Jefferson in the County area of Emerald Hills. Sidewalks exist where Jefferson is inside the boundaries of Redwood City, but not in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County. My children will be walking to school (Roy Cloud) and I fear for their safety where there is no sidewalk. Any chance sidewalks could be installed on the short distance between Roy Cloud School and the Jefferson/Lakeview intersection? 2. There are a large amount of bikers that use Jefferson to travel from the Alameda area of Redwood City to Canada Road. I think more bikers use Jefferson than use Farm Hill. However, the Comprehensive Plan calls for bike lanes on Farm Hill and not Jefferson. Any chance Jefferson could get them?	Sidewalk request forwarded to County. Jefferson is too narrow to receive bike lanes in many sections (20' wide). Not added to plan.
10.1	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	Identify and correct barriers to bicycling. Barriers are identified in section 3.1.4. Needs more specific details on how will be addressed	Document already includes Table 1: Summary of Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges and Undercrossings Across Major Barriers. Proposed crossings of major barriers included in appendix A. Maps in Chapter 6 and appendix A updated to include major barriers.
10.2	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	Not Mentioned: Build a connecting bike path at the Millbrae Caltrain/BART station to Center Street, Millbrae	Path extents confirmed with City. Plan shows proposed Class I path from Millbrae BART/Caltrain Station along railroad tracks to Center Street in Millbrae.
10.3	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	Not Mentioned: Complete the mandated BART SSF to Millbrae bike path completion	No document changes. "BART only provided funding to prepare a long term Class I trail plan. No funding for construction was identified. Plan is completed."
10.4	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	Not Mentioned: Encourage BART to construct the mandated POC at Rollins Road to Airport Boulevard	POC added after confirmation with City of Millbrae. "City has completed PSR/PR for the Millbrae Ave POC. Alignment of the new POC will be located immediately north of the existing freeway overpass."

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
10.5	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	El Camino Grand Boulevard Multimodal Corridor (3 rating)	Added sentence to description of priority corridor North South Bikeway in Chapter 6.
10.6	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	Address difficulty crossing US101. Mentioned numerous times as high priority, but lacking means to ensure compliance	No change.
10.7	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	Redwood City Bridge to No Where Not mentioned.	No change. Plan shows proposed connections to bridge. Mentioning bridge in the CBPP is not appropriate, as we don't give this level of detail for other projects.
10.8	3/31/2011	Steve Vanderlip	Urban Trails. Mentioned, but little specifics.	No change.
11.1	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	A fundamental weakness in the Plan is the apparent misalignment of its prioritized projects with its stated goals. If funding is summed by project group, the real funding priority is more obvious: Priority Corridors (\$26.5M), Major Barriers (\$20M), and lastly Countywide Bicycle Network (\$10.2M). Looking only at the Tier I projects, the funding priority is Priority Corridors (\$5.2M) and CBN (\$2.2M). Either way, Priority Corridors, which are mainly recreational, are given greater priority than the CBN. Therefore, many of the Plan's projects may be at odds with the real goals.	Disagree with analysis. Looking at mileage, more miles of CBN projects are recommended in T1 and T2 than priority corridors. In any case, revised CBN prioritization matrix to remove priority corridor gap closure criterion, increase safety points, and include pedestrian collisions in addition to bicycle collisions in safety calculation. Priority corridors remain in plan, but are not used in prioritization but instead listed as one of several project groups. They include both transportation and recreation.
11.2	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	A1: Include all projects identified by cities and county in their local plans in Appendix A.	No change. Comment later clarified to request including future financial needs for bike and ped projects. As only a handful of jurisdictions had this information available, we did not summarize and include in plan.
11.3	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	A2: Add projects in Appendix A, where missing, for all gaps in the CBN.	Most gaps in CBN are already in local plans, and so are incorporated as proposed projects. Major gap on Middlefield Road has been closed.
11.4	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	A3: Add bicycle support facility projects that enhance the CBN such as racks, lockers, and signage.	Bike parking has been added as a countywide bicycle focus area in Chapter 6.
11.5	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	B1: State in Section 8.3 that TDA Article 3 and Measure A funding will be prioritized for CBN projects.	No change. This is the intention of the plan already.
11.6	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	B2: State that C/CAG will use vehicle license fee and flexible federal congestion mitigation and surface transportation funds for bicycle projects.	No change. Out of scope of C/CAG jurisdiction.
11.7	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	B3: State that C/CAG will apply for grants to implement capital-intensive PC and Major Barrier projects.	No change. C/CAG is not implementing agency.
11.8	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C1: Score Weighting: increase the points for Safety such that it accounts for at least 33% of the total	We have increased weight of safety criteria, and added pedestrian collisions as well as bike collisions.
11.9	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C2: Safety: change the criterion to use the federal Safety Indices (FHWA-HRT-06-130) or equivalent	No change. The level of detail/data required of this analysis is prohibitive for doing on a countywide level. Recommend considering this analysis for CFP rankings.
11.1	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C3: Safety: explicitly state how the safety points are assigned based on the Index	Cutoff values used for safety analysis added to Table 11.
11.11	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C4: Station Access: expand the radius to 1.75 miles for biking and include 0.5 miles for walking	No Change. Though FTA has proposed a 3-mile catchment area for bicyclists around transit, we have decided to reflect a shorter distance due to the need to allow different scoring between projects. If we used 3-mile radius, the majority of projects within the urbanized area would score the same, negating the importance of the transit criterion. Prioritization criteria described in Chapter 6 not applied to pedestrian projects, so not appropriate to include walking.
11.12	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C5: Station Access: assign points based on proximity for each mode, rather than all-or-nothing	Prioritization criteria described in Chapter 6 not applied to pedestrian projects, so not appropriate to include walking. Revised prioritization to assign scores based on 0.5, 1.0 and 1.5 mile buffers.
11.13	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C6: Activity Center Access: explicitly state how the 8 and 12 points are assigned based on density	Added to Table 11.
11.14	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C7: Underserved Communities: state that social equity is a policy in section 2 or remove this criterion	Added policy "Policy 2.7: Encourage local agencies to implement infrastructure and programs that improve the safety, comfort and convenience of walking and bicycling in underserved communities." To chapter 2.
11.15	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	C8: Gap Closure: include all project categories, do not limit to Priority Corridors	Removed gap closure criterion. Most proposed bikeways are gap closure.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
11.16	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Priority Corridors 1:Revisions. Add Alameda de las Pulgas corridor (from Crystal Springs Rd. in San Mateo to Santa Cruz Ave. in Menlo Park)	Alameda de Las Pulgas identified as a Priority Corridor.
11.17	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Priority Corridors 1: Revisions: add Woodside Road	Woodside Road identified as Priority Corridor.
11.18	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Priority Corridors 2: Revisions: add route East side of 101	East of 101 North South Corridor added as a priority corridor.
11.19	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Priority Corridors 3: close gap in Middlefield Road in N. Fair Oaks	Middlefield Road gap has been closed.
11.2	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Priority Corridors 4: Eliminate jog to the west in N-S Bikeway in Millbrae. Add bike path along west side of RR tracks.	Plan shows proposed Class I path from Millbrae BART/Caltran Station along railroad tracks to Center Street in Millbrae.
11.21	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Priority Corridors 5: Gaps in Bay Trail Not addressed. Eg convenient connection between completed sections N and S of San Carlos Airport.	No change. This has been addressed with on-street connections.
11.22	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Major Barriers: Add Map and list of major barriers to Section 6.4.	Document already includes Table 1: Summary of Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges and Undercrossings Across Major Barriers. Proposed xings of major barriers included in appendix A. Maps in Chapter 6 and appendix A updated to include major barriers.
11.23	3/30/2011	Mark Eliot	Bicycle Parking: As such, bike parking projects at major destinations should be included in Appendix A.	Add bike parking funding section to chapter 6. Level of detail required for identifying specific locations for bicycle parking is not appropriate for countywide plan.
12	4/7/2011	City of SSF - Tracy Scramaglia	The SSF BPAC and City staff reviewed the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Comments were correlated at BPAC's regular meeting on April 6, 2011. The following are a summary of the comments: 1. This document should provide a process for annual updates, including correcting errors that are found in the document. The Plan is a "live" document, although there is no mention of that. 2. Table 5: local Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Efforts (page 31-33) - This table should provide specific contact names for the various jurisdiction Bike/Ped Advisory Committee's instead of just listing whether or not there is one. 3. Table 5: local Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Efforts (page 33) - Under the City of South San Francisco, it indicates the City's Bicycle Master Plan is in the approval process. The City adopted its Bicycle Master Plan on February 9, 2011. This section should be updated. 4. We assume that the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan will be available online when approved. Links should be available within the document to other city's Bike/Ped Plans, City's websites, City's BPAC contacts, and other relevant links as appropriate. If you have any questions about the comments above, please email or call me at 650-829-6651.	1. Included update procedure in implementation chapter. Recommend that C/CAG issue errata memos as errors come to light, and solicit broader review of plan every 2 years and issue memo summarizing updates. 2. This list is more appropriate for the C/CAG website than the plan. 3. Removed footnote and added "Bicycle Master Plan (2011)" to table 5 4. pdfed document will have click-able links.
14	4/10/2011	Marge Colapietro	Greetings John. Acknowledgements page: I think we should indicate, Vice Chair after Judi Mosqueda's name. Khee Lim of our PW department, but may not be able to do so by 15th as they and we are preparing for our CC meeting on Tuesday. I'll do so as quickly as I can meet with staff. Thank you for your patience.	Change made to acknowledgements page.
15	4/11/2011	Marge Colapietro	While reading through the CBPP Draft, I wanted to ensure that our city information was correct. was able to follow-up today and I have the following to add, in addition to my comment relative to the "title" of Vice Chair being added on the page of Acknowledgements after Judi Mosqueda's name: Page 32 of the Needs Analysis, City of Millbrae: *3rd Column from left "Other Relevant Plans" please insert: Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan (2009) *4th Column from left "Bike/Ped Advisory Committee?" please now say: Parks & Recreation Commission & BPAC Sub-Committee Page 38 of the Needs Analysis, City of Millbrae: *If "2000" Census information will be used, then Millbrae stats okay - our staff does not have stats. from 2010 Census. Page 45 of the Needs Analysis, City of Millbrae: *Information compiled from 2010 Census Data appears to be okay. Thank you for ensuring the updates are included!	Changes made.
16.1	4/14/2011	John Langbein	I would like to see the written comments provided by the public (and public organizations) be included in an appendix of the Plan with thoughtful feedback provided by either the Consultants and/or C/CAG staff.	A comment summary has been provided as an appendix to the document, and the full comments with responses have been uploaded to the project website.
16.2	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Use of collision data is flawed to identify which corridors should be improved over others. Data is incomplete, data sets are small, data is not normalized for the # of bicyclists on a route.	No change. Collision analysis is one component of overall prioritization methods. Data to normalize collisions by rider is not available. We attempt to normalize it by looking at reported collisions per mile.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

#No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
16.3	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Normalize collision data in tables.	No change. Table 9 presents collision #'s as percentages next to population percentages in an effort to normalize this data.
16.4	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Figure 10 and 11. "High and Low" labels are meaningless.	Units added to collision maps.
16.5	4/14/2011	John Langbein	AB1358 only mentioned in passing. Complete streets act should be mentioned and repeated several times in plan.	No change. Described in policies, Described in Section 4.2, referenced in section 6.2.2, Major Barriers, referenced in section 7.3.2, described in appendix D.
16.6	4/14/2011	John Langbein	County needs bicycle coordinator	No change to plan. Added to Open Item Status List. C/CAG recognizes the desire for a countywide bike/ped coordinator and is discussing long-term options with San Mateo County Health System and other agencies.
16.7	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Completion of bike route along Alameda de las Pulgas Corridor, particularly through Belmont.	Alameda de las Pulgas is in the plan, and has been added to the list of Priority Corridors.
16.8	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Close gap in Middlefield Road through N. Fair Oaks.	Middlefield Road gap has been closed.
16.9	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Add: Stage, Pescadero, West Alpine, Rt 84, West Old La Honda, Lobitos and Lobitos Creek, Tunitas, Cloverdale, Gazos, and Higgins/Pursima as recreational routes.	No change made.
16.1	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Table 4, status of 2000 bike plan, item 15. The table should indicate that there are sharrows on McDonnell Rd within SFIA.	Table updated.
16.11	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Popular, but illegal crossing points of Caltrain should be cataloged and flagged as projects that would provide a safe crossing.	No change made. Level of detail not appropriate for countywide plan.
16.12	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Table 5, Local Bike and Ped planning efforts. Note that Redwood City does NOT have any official committee.	No change. We note there's a proposed committee.
16.13	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Santa Cruz Ave (West Menlo Park) between the Alameda and Avy/Orange does NOT have Class II bike lane; This currently is a problem as the motor vehicle lane is narrow and the parking strip is filled with cars.	Santa Cruz Ave between Alameda de Las Pulgas and Avy Avenue in West Menlo Park changed from existing bike lanes to existing bike route.
16.14	4/14/2011	John Langbein	The little green path (Class I) connecting Alpine with Sand Hill does not meet Caltrans minimum standards as a Class I facility. In fact, the adjacent, on roadway section needs improvement; For instance, for south bound cyclists turning on Junipero Serra need to quick merge over 2 (maybe 3?) lanes to safely make this turn.	No change made. Aerial photos indicate that path appears to meet standards.
16.15	4/14/2011	John Langbein	How is the bridge across Redwood Creek east of RT101 classified? Currently, although the bridge was constructed with public funding, there is no right-of-way for the public to use this critical bridge.	No change made.
16.16	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Extend the planned by facility on Woodside RD from El Camino to Seaport Center east of RT101.	No change made. Redwood City notes no immediate plans for the bridge, except that the path leading to the bridge on the E. Bayshore side may be improved slightly as part of the approved Marina One development. In the future, depending on future development east of highway 101, this bridge could likely be removed and incorporated into a new bridge design as part of an E. Bayshore Rd. extension/bridge over the creek.
16.17	4/14/2011	John Langbein	There are three bike bridges across the creek between Menlo Park and Palo Alto; the map on Page 56 only shows one.	Bridges added.
16.18	4/14/2011	John Langbein	The bike path (class 1) north of Whipple and just east of 101 needs to connect with the bike path next to Steinberger Slough with a combination of Class 1 and 2 facilities that avoid being on the roadway of Redwood Shore Parkway. Both Pico lane and an abandon path next to Pico could be used for a connection.	No change made. This connection was discussed with SamTrans prior to release of the Feb 2011 draft, and not approved.
16.19	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Twin Dolphin does not have a class 1 facility unless one counts sidewalks.	No change made.
16.2	4/14/2011	John Langbein	Ralston Ave between El Camino and RT 92 should be upgraded to include bike lanes. This road has potentially high use for cycling. An analog is Woodside Rd west of El Camino; the bike plan lists that road as Class 2.	No change. Designated as unclassified on-street.
16.21	4/14/2011	John Langbein	A very popular and useful commute route is another variation of the one depicted in Atherton; Going north from Elena, use Barry, Selby Lane, West Selby Lane, San Carlos, Massachusetts to Alameda	No change. CBPP already includes similar route.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
16.22	4/14/2011	John Langbein	In the companion Resource Guide, my overall impression, at least for the bicycle facilities, it provides the same information as Chapter 1000 of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. Rather, I would have like to see that the Guide provide a Best Practices message.	No change. Guide includes innovative treatments.
17.1	4/14/2011	Bob Page	To realize an effective county bikeways system, we need a proactive bikeways coordinator at the county level who would work with all the local jurisdictions to implement a regional bikeways network.	No change to plan. Added to Open Item Status List. C/CAG recognizes the desire for a countywide bike/ped coordinator and is discussing long-term options with San Mateo County Health System and other agencies.
17.2	4/14/2011	Bob Page	Priority corridor 1: Gap in Middlefield Road through N. Fair Oaks	Middlefield Road gap closed.
17.3	4/14/2011	Bob Page	Priority Corridor 2: Alameda de las Pulgas from Crystal Springs Road in San Mateo to Santa Cruz Avenue in Menlo Park should be identified as a Priority Corridor (Figure 17)	Alameda de Las Pulgas added as a priority corridor.
17.4	4/14/2011	Bob Page	Local Area 1: Menlo Park/Redwood City/Atherton, Marsh Road is an essential route for cross-county travel, but its southern end (south of Fair Oaks Avenue) is narrow and the Middlefield Road intersection is very unfriendly for cyclists. A safer —east/west— bike route is recommended from the Bay Road / Marsh Road intersection to the Alameda de las Pulgas. From the Bay/Marsh intersection, the route follows Bay Road, 18th Avenue, 15th Avenue, Palmer Lane, Fair Oaks Lane and Atherton Avenue.	Route not added to plan. However plan identifies parallel low-volume routes as appropriate for local city development.
17.5	4/14/2011	Bob Page	Local area 2: Redwood City/Atherton A useful bike route from the Alameda De Las Pulgas in Redwood City to Valparaiso Avenue near downtown Menlo Park, which avoids a lot of motorized traffic, follows Massachusetts Avenue (bike lanes), San Carlos Avenue, West Selby Lane, Selby Lane, Atherton Avenue, Barry Lane and Elena Avenue.	No change to plan. Corridor is close to another similar low-volume route.
17.6	4/14/2011	Bob Page	Local Area 3: Woodside a) Figures 16 and B-12 should show solid blue lines to indicate existing bike lanes on: Sand Hill Road -- Whiskey Hill Road to Portola Road Portola Road -- Sand Hill Road to Portola Valley boundary Whiskey Hill Road -- Sand Hill Road to Woodside Road <u>Some of these lanes were marked recently</u>	Facilities Added
17.7	4/14/2011	Bob Page	b) In Figure B-12, Woodside Road is mislabeled as —Tripp Rd	Renamed
17.8	4/14/2011	Bob Page	The short loop labeled —Manzanita Way— that parallels Mountain Home Road is inappropriate to show on a countywide plan. (As depicted in Figure B-12, the southern part of the loop is on Winding Way.)	Removed
17.9	4/14/2011	Bob Page	Does the proposed Class I path between Canada Road and Farm Hill Boulevard require an easement across private property? If so, an alternative location might be to start the path from Canada Road at the Cal Water triangle of land immediately south of the I-280 underpass.	No change made. We have not looked at the path with that level of detail. Alignment in plan is suggested, but not finalized.
18.1	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Bike Parking should be considered as being regionally significant, especially in the Rail Corridor, TOD areas and at regional destinations like downtowns and Caltrain/Bart stations.	Bike parking has been added as a countywide bicycle focus area in Chapter 6.
18.2	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page ii – Existing Conditions - The Railroad tracks aren't mentioned as a barrier here and are barely mentioned in the Existing Chapter section (page 14).	Added sentence to page ii in executive summary. Expanded discussion in Existing Conditions Chapter.
18.3	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page vii – Pedestrian Prioritization Criteria – It appears that over 90% of the County's population is in the Pedestrian Focus area.	Reduced the school buffer to 1/8 mile, narrowing the definitions of Pedestrian Focus Areas
18.4	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page 14 – Barriers – See above note about the railroad tracks. I would add some further analysis or a few more sentences to describe the railroad ped/bike crossings.	See response to 18.2
18.5	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page 15 – Bicycle Infrastructure – Bicycle parking should be included as infrastructure or at least mention it as support facilities. See note above as well.	Added sentence to section 3.2.1. Bike parking has been added as a countywide bicycle focus area in Chapter 6.
18.6	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page 26 – Employment Density – “.....in Foster City north south of State Route 92.”	Correction made.
18.7	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page 26 - Section 4.4.3 - The aging demographics is REALLY important. This section seems to get lost in the shuffle here. There should be further analysis or description here with a few graphics. A growth chart with ages would help, plus maybe a chart by cities and where the largest senior growth is going to come from.	Added chart from County Aging Model.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
18.8	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	• Page 34 – Bicyclist Categories – This is a great definition of bicycle riders and what % of the population each category represents. I have seen this before in a horizontal bar graph and I would suggest adding it here too for extra emphasis.	Added bar chart.
18.9	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page 36 – Section 5.2.1 – There are great crash statistics that state if you are over a certain age (senior) you are more likely to die from a collision with a motor vehicle. I would throw this in to beef this section up, think the crash statistics came out of the Pedestrian Counts Summit or from the Health Department, but it basically says that the older you are the less likely you are able to recover from a collision with a motor vehicle and more likely to die from it.	Added chart (figure 9) illustrating relationship between speed and pedestrian fatality. Added sentences to section 5.2.1 related to senior and child collisions.
18.1	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page 50 – Signage – For regionally significant routes, ie, the North-South CBN, the signage is pretty small, Understanding that we are confined to some extent to the MUTCD, can you beef up the sign a bit and make it more significant and noticeable?	No change. The wayfinding signage recommended is fairly obvious and significant. Much better than the old numbering signage from MUTCD.
18.11	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page 80 – Section 8.3.1 – “Since there is a wide array of pedestrian related projects, projects within the Pedestrian Focus Areas would receive higher consideration for funding over projects in areas not defined in the CBPP.” The problem that I have with this sentence is that everything is in the Pedestrian Focus Area, so this isn’t as valid and as strong as if the Pedestrian Focus Area area is more defined.	Reduced the school buffer to 1/8 mile, narrowing the definitions of Pedestrian Focus Areas
18.12	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page A-7 – San Mateo – Project Title – Hillsdale Boulevard – Edison to S. Norfolk – This project must be an error because PW has no record of it or plans. Please call to confirm.	This is the Hillsdale Overcrossing. Name changed in document and costs revised accordingly.
18.13	4/14/2011	San Mateo - Gary Heap	Page A-7 – San Mateo – Project Title – San Mateo Caltrain/Shore Connector – Distance and route are off because the path would go past Kehoe and around the school. Plus, there is no mention of a 101 overcrossing here. Please call to confirm or check with Jenifer.	Map correction made.
19.1	4/15/2011	Andrew Boone	One major flaw of the Plan is that it does not propose any bicycle improvements for Middlefield Rd through unincorporated area North Fair Oaks (between Charter and 5th Ave)	Middlefield Road gap closed.
19.2	4/16/2011	Andrew Boone	Another major omission of the Plan is a recommendation that the county assign a full time Bicycle Program Coordinator	C/CAG recognizes the desire for a countywide bike/ped coordinator and is discussing long-term options with San Mateo County Health System and other agencies.
19.3	4/17/2011	Andrew Boone	The bicycle lanes on University Avenue from Donohoe St. to Bayfront Expwy should be striped to 6.5 ft wide.	No change. Suggest bringing up with EPA directly. Specific project details are left for Cities to implement. Identification of a project in the plan as existing does not preclude a city from applying for funding to improve that corridor.
19.4	4/18/2011	Andrew Boone	There are several errors in the Existing Bikeways shown on the maps in Appendix B of the Plan for East Palo Alto. *Please correct them: Pulgas Ave is shown as having bicycle lanes. There are no bicycle lanes on Pulgas Ave.	Changed Pulgas Avenue to proposed Class II bike lanes.
19.5	4/19/2011	Andrew Boone	Bay Rd is shown as having bicycle lanes from University Ave to Pulgas Ave. The bicycle lanes on Bay Rd actually extend from Addison Ave to Clarke Ave.	Revised existing bike lanes on Bay Road to reflect comment change.
19.6	4/20/2011	Andrew Boone	There is an “Existing Over/undercrossing” shown at Euclid Ave and Highway 101. There is no existing overcrossing or undercrossing here.	Changed to proposed. Undercrossing exists, but is closed.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
20	4/15/2011	San Mateo County - Diana Shu	See attached e-mail dated 4/15/11 and markup of the CBPP (SMC) please add the following bicycle trail projects to you appendix tables if they are not already listed: Mirada Road, Class I bicycle Trail from Magellan to Mirada Rd in Moss Beach. Crystal Springs Bike Trail from Hwy 92 to CS Dam. Bicycle routes at highway intersections countywide. Mirada Surf I and II completed trails. CSM Coastal Trail	Corrections and additions to document completed. Project scoring does not include recreation. We do identify CBN focus areas (formerly priority corridors) that include major recreational facilities. Middlefield Road added to CBN.
21	4/15/2011	San Bruno - Laura Russell	See attached e-mail dated 4/15/11 21 San Bruno Comments.doc -map updates -clarification for cost of Tier 1 project for Unincorporated County (SFO) on page A 2. - clarification for Tier 2 Arterial Crossings listed for San Bruno on page A 6. It is unclear as to what the \$20,000 per crossing will pay for. - Ped focus areas too broad to be useful.	Refined pedestrian focus areas by shrinking buffer around schools. Provide clarification on Tier 1 project for Unincorporated County (SFO) .(San Bruno Overcrossing): Yes, that cost estimate was calculated as standard Class I path (should not have been) and is too low. Using 5.2 million cost provided in 2000 plan, adjusted for inflation to 6.5 million. Clarification provided for Tier 2 Arterial Crossings listed for San Bruno on page A 6.
22	4/15/2011	Redwood City - Susan Wheeler	See attached e-mail dated 4/15/11 22 RWC Comments.doc -higher resolution on maps -p 32 Downtown Precise Plan was adopted in 2011, not 2010. - Page 43 and 44 The raw frequency of bike and ped collisions is the wrong thing to map. Rather than frequency, these maps should be based on collisions per bike/ped mile travelled, or per bike/ped trip - Page 64 and 65 Overcrossings should be considered a last resort they are miserable and shunned. For situations like Woodside Road, we need to avoid overcrossings and put in sidewalks and crosswalks if we want to be truly walkable. Only over freeways, canyons, or rivers should they be used, not on at grade arterials. - There are a few existing bikeway segments in Redwood City that are not included in the CBN map (e.g. Figure E 1, page vi) but which are significant and should be added to the map. (lists bikeways) -There is an existing pedestrian overcrossing -mention the proposed High Speed Rail and any concerns that it not create additional barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists. over the Caltrain tracks located adjacent to Woodside Road. This could be shown on the maps (e.g. on page ix and 69). -Check for minor typos throughout document. Page 1, last paragraph: should "presses" be "stresses"? Page 37, last line says Menlo Park's percentage of bicycle commuters is 3.5%, but the table on the following page lists it as 3.7%. -Additionally, it appears that some of the Tier 1, 2, and 3 bikeway projects listed for Redwood City in Appendix A may already be completed, or in the County's jurisdiction. I will confirm and get	Map changes made. Higher resolution maps will be provided. Maps will include labels for all streets with bikeways and labels for cities and train stations. Collision maps show collisions per quarter mile, rather than raw number of collisions. Data to determine rate per bicyclist or rate per pedestrian is unavailable. Added text to "Major Barrier Crossings" in section 7.2 to clarify when overcrossings are appropriate. Strengthened language about improving existing roadway crossings. Typos corrected.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
23	4/15/2011	Half Moon Bay - Mo Sharma	See attached e-mail dated 4/15/11 and referenced maps (2 total) 23 HMB Comments.doc, 23 HMB_attach2.pdf, 23 HMB_attach1.pdf -edits to pathways along hwy 1 in HMB (described) -request to add bus routes along HWY 92 of countywide significance -Barriers - mention non-existent/narrow shoulders on 92 -modify fig 6 to show area of employment density along rte 92 within 2 mi of rte 1 -update table 5 to show parks and rec commission as bike ped advisory committee -update figure 15 on pg 55 to show completed & proposed path in hwy 1 corridor south of rte 92 (description) Remove costal trail between seymour st and redondo beach road. amend fig 17 and fig 21 likewise -amend fig b-8 -move pathways in HMB along rte 1 and rete 92 up to tier 1	Maps updated per comments. Document edits incorporated.
24	4/18/2011	Caltrans - Ina Gerhard	See attached e-mail dated 4/18/11 24 Caltrans Comments.doc - Pages 57/58 Countywide Bikeway Network Major Barriers: It would be helpful to have the major barriers listed in a table plus a column that indicates whether the barrier is part of a Priority Corridor or the Countywide Bikeway Network (or both). - Concerns about recreational nature of priority corridors.	Revising CBN prioritization matrix to remove priority corridor gap closure criterion, increase safety points, and include pedestrian collisions in addition to bicycle collisions in safety calculation. Priority corridor idea is removed, and replaced with focus corridors that are important longer county-level corridors, divided by recreational vs. commuter. Document already includes Table 1: Summary of Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges and Undercrossings Across Major Barriers. Proposed xings of major barriers included in appendix A. Maps in Chapter 6 and appendix A updated to include major barriers.
25	4/18/2011	SVBC	See attached letter dated 4/18/11	No response needed.
26	4/18/2011	Samtrans - Marisa Espinosa	Voicemail - are all overcrossings included? Will send more comments via e-mail	Document already includes Table 1: Summary of Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges and Undercrossings Across Major Barriers. Proposed xings of major barriers included in appendix A. Maps in Chapter 6 and appendix A updated to include major barriers.
27	4/20/2011	San Mateo Parks/PW - Cecily Harris	See attached e-mail dated 4/19/11 and attachments (2 files)	Projects added to Countywide Bikeway Network.
28.1	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Projects 1. Include low-speed roadway designs such as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects. 2. Implement a network of bicycle boulevards within five years linked to the land uses of children 3. Implement a variety of bikeway facility types. 4. Include traffic calming as a means of designing enforcement into the street.	Added new sub-section to Section 6.2: "Designing for Bicyclists of All Abilities," Referenced NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide. Added language regarding identifying bicycle boulevards and as alternative routes to CBN.
28.2	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Projects 5. Include plazas, place making, parking free zones, local economy development, and peripheral congestion priced parking in the pedestrian focus areas.	Added sentence to "Downtown Area Improvements"
28.3	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Projects 6. Work with San Mateo County Health System to get data on how proposed projects, programs, and policies will positively impact physical activity, differentiated by strong or emerging evidence.	No change. More appropriate for post-plan review than incorporation into this plan.
28.4	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Projects 7. Start a counter cyclical tax on gasoline that increases toward a stable target because higher prices increase modal share. Start a counter cyclical tax on gasoline that increases toward a stable target because higher prices increase modal share.	No change. Out of scope of plan/C/CAG jurisdiction.
28.5	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Project 8. Ten and fifteen year time frames are not in the public interest, set a goal to convert road space to accessible networks in the next five years.	No change. Setting shorter timeframes will not move projects forward faster. 10 years is very short time frame to get roadway improvements constructed.
28.6	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Programs. 1. Include temporary street closures. Streets Alive should be a focus of this plan.	Added Streets Alive to programs section in Chapter 3.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
28.7	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Programs 2. Include systematic traffic calming where necessary tied to bicycle boulevards. Cheap traffic calming with plastic cones and drums is preferable to no traffic calming.	This level of detail not appropriate for countywide plan. Resource guide includes traffic calming and bicycle boulevards. Disagree with note that cheap traffic calming is preferable to none--some communities will object to traffic calming if it's ugly.
28.8	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Programs 3. Add programs that encourage congestion price automobile parking in resident and business benefit districts where main bicycle routes and pedestrian zones exist and modal share is high.	See response to comment 28.2
28.9	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Programs 4. Penalize jurisdictions if pedestrian and bicyclist safety needs are compromised for Congestion Management (see safety measures under the SAFETEA-LU and the state's safety implementation plan http://www.dot.ca.gov/SHSP).	No change. CBPP is not appropriate place to address this issue, C/CAG to forward comment to Countywide Transportation Plan project manager.
28.1	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Programs 5. To eliminate gaps, make "safe access and connectivity," a criteria for funding.	No change. C/CAG to consider this criteria for next CFP. Item added to Open Item Status Report.
28.11	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Policies 1. Declare measureable targets for project objectives. The plan should include: - Numeric objectives that define a desirable level of service for gender safe bicycle parking. - Which government agency is responsible for implementation and when. - Benchmarks and performance measures for assessing progress.	No change. CBPP will not include this level of detail. Item added to Open Item Status Report.
28.12	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Policies 2. Prioritize projects and adopt policies that increase the following measures of walkability: connectivity, urban design, land use mix, and residential density. Specific proposals for consideration (not mentioned in the plan) include: - Limit construction of projects that don't have paseos or prioritize walking accessibility. - Connect existing cul-de-sacs, dead ends, or blocks longer than 100-feet. - Limit block size. - Design for imageability, enclosure, human scale, transparency, and complexity (See Ewing et al., 2006). - Encourage a dense accessible mix of land uses. Encourage a dense accessible mix of land uses.	Added paragraph to section 7.2
28.13	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Policy 3. Create policies to increase bicycle and pedestrian access to nutritious food.	No change. Good policy, feel existing policies cover it.
28.14	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Policy 4. Design for inexperienced cyclists. The plan does mention the needs of inexperienced cyclists but does not promote a network accessible to inexperienced cyclists.	See response to comment 28.1
28.15	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Policy 5. Include health and equity in project evaluation criteria- a critical missing component. Especially address the public service benefits of how energy is conserved.	Equity is addressed in both bike and ped prioritization criteria, by referring to MTC's communities of concern. Health equity is too difficult to measure for a prioritization structure, so no change.
28.16	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Policy 6. Recognize increased numbers of bicyclists and pedestrians as a safety strategy. Eliminate Level of Service from decision making in pedestrian priority areas and bicycle network corridors.	No change made. Analysis of traffic impacts is required by NEPA, and so cannot be eliminated, but communities can choose to use a different method of calculating LOS at their discretion. Out of scope of Plan.
28.17	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Policy 7 Use the National Household Travel Survey to determine land use efficiencies for walkability and likeability.	No change made. We use NHTS data for sections of chapter 4, but an analysis of the land use efficiencies of walkability and bikability, while very interesting, is a separate research project in itself and beyond the scope of this plan.
28.18	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Data 1. Walkability should be measured as a composite of net residential density, road network connectivity, retail floor-area ratio, and land use mix. This index is well established in the literature as a predictor of physical activity (Sallis et al., 2009). A map should show what block groups have the highest walkability.	No change made. We are confident that our measurement of walkability, which relies on several of these factors and is similarly based on research is sufficient for the plan. See appendix C for more detail on the analysis.
28.19	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Data 2. Bikeability should be measured in bikeway miles/square miles. It should be noted, however, that most of the measures of walkability are also relevant to bikeability, as walkability accounts for variables such as land use, connectivity, and density. A map should show what block groups have the highest bikeability.	No change made. An accurate measurement of bikeability would require additional data sources, which are not available to us at a countywide level.
28.2	4/20/2011	Sierra Club - Megan Fluke	Bicycle infrastructure - add bicycle boulevard	Bicycle boulevards are included in resource guide. Also see response to comment 28.1.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
29.1	4/21/2011	SVBC	1. Increasing the number a/projects in the CBN. a. we observe that the Countywide Bicycle Network projects only receive \$2.2M in Tier 1, out of \$25.5M total. We feel that projects such as those in the CBN should be more of a priority than recreational trails	Revised CBN prioritization matrix to remove priority corridor gap closure criterion, increase safety points, and include pedestrian collisions in addition to bicycle collisions in safety calculation. Priority corridor idea is removed, and replaced with focus corridors that are important longer county-level corridors, divided by recreational vs. commuter. The smaller cost of projects in the Countywide Bikeway Network owes more to those projects being predominantly Class II and Class III, which are significantly less expensive than Class I paths. The mileage recommended for each project type is more balanced.
29.2	4/21/2011	SVBC	1.b. include more than just the MTC regional routes in the CBPP	Noted. We do include more than the Regional Bikeways in the countywide plan. <u>Regional bikeways are one component of the CBN.</u>
29.3	4/21/2011	SVBC	2. Incorporate GBI by adding all undesignated portions of ECR as "unclassified on-street"	No change made. In working with jurisdictions along that corridor we asked if they would consider bikeways along ECR. Some agreed, some did not. Designating ECR to a complete street could be considered for future plan updates.
29.4	4/21/2011	SVBC	Develop a website for sponsor agencies to upload MTC complete streets checklists, And presumably allow public review)	No change. Added to Open Item Status Report.
29.5	4/21/2011	SVBC	Expand list of projects that require MTC complete streets checklist to all projects funded by C/CAG/SMCTA	No change. Added to Open Item Status Report.
29.6	4/21/2011	SVBC	Bring major projects to BPAC during planning and pre-construction phases.	No change. Added to Open Item Status Report.
30	4/14/2011	C/CAG - Madalena	See attached markup of draft	Responded to all comments.
31	4/19/2011	San Mateo - Ken Chin	One final comment on the CBPP - Considering the new interim approval of the green pavement markings, a project should be added to the CBPP for a green pavement markings to be used on all countywide routes, especially the North-South route. Funding could even come from the C/CAG BPAC for a countywide project. This would be a great thing to implement at the conclusion/adoption of the CBPP	No change. Implementation detail not covered in countywide plan. However, green bike lanes are included in resource guide pg 96.
32	4/25/2011	San Mateo County - Joe LoCoco	See attached e-mail dated 4/25/11 <u>identify middlefield road in N. Fair Oaks as unclassified on-street</u>	Middlefield Road added to CBN.
33	5/3/2011	Samuel Herzberg	There will likely be some projects that will come out of these studies and we would like to include them into any planning effort that will qualify them for future BP funding. I think we had a line regarding Parks and Rec bike and ped trails, but this report includes Highway 1 crossings. http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/Attachments/parks/Files/Parks%20Planning/Highway%201%20Safety%20and%20Mobility%20Improvement%20Study.pdf Thanks Diana	Included proposed overcrossings and other improvements as recommended in the Highway 1 Safety Improvement Plan.
34.1	5/4/2011	Jean Fraser, County of San Mateo Health System	Clarify and strengthen C/CAG's role in bicycle and pedestrian coordination by: 1. designating C/CAG as coordinating agency for county 2. including an organizational chart indicating staff positions and full-time equivalencies devoted to supporting bicycle and pedestrian activity in the County.	No change to plan. Added to Open Item Status List. C/CAG recognizes the desire for a countywide bike/ped coordinator and is discussing long-term options with San Mateo County Health System and other agencies.
34.2	5/4/2011	Jean Fraser, County of San Mateo Health System	Add a Bicycle Demand Model and require the use of demand models in prioritizing funding	No change. Consultant looked into running Bicycle Demand Model, but the required data is not available at a county level. As an alternative, we included key variables from the model (e.g. employment) in the criteria for prioritizing bikeways. We feel that this provides a good proxy for bicycle demand, given the <u>limited available data</u> .
34.3	5/4/2011	Jean Fraser, County of San Mateo Health System	Integrate more of the Resource Guide to provide the leadership that cities seek. highlight lessons and successes from places that have implemented what appears in the Resource Guide.	No change made.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
34.4	5/4/2011	Jean Fraser, County of San Mateo Health System	Give greater attention to a broader definition of equity. The MTC Communities of Concern designation is a good start for prioritizing low-income areas as bikeway projects are sorted into three tiers (Section 6.5, Table 11, pg. 59). But this criterion should be updated by C/CAG's consultants, using 2010 Census income and ethnicity figures and an earnings threshold of at least 200% of the federal poverty limit to better reflect the most current areas of need and <i>our higher cost of living</i> .	2010 Poverty data is not yet available at a block group level for San Mateo County.
34.5	5/4/2011	Jean Fraser, County of San Mateo Health System	Revise the call for projects and selection system to better reflect and support CBPP goals and policies. Rather than stating, on page 80, that C/CAG and SMCT A "may want to consider" a focused implementation strategy we urge the agencies to exhibit greater commitment by changing the language in the final plan to "will commit to using" a focused implementation <i>strategy (Section 8.3.2 Implementation Approach (pgs. 80-81))</i> .	Changed wording.
34.6	5/4/2011	Jean Fraser, County of San Mateo Health System	Support low-cost innovations to connect County employees and meet the demands of our planned future. Health System requests C/CAG's collaboration in a modification to create a safe biking connection between Redwood City County Center and the County offices at One Circle Star Way. C/CAG, community members, the Health System, other relevant County departments, and Redwood City collaborate to pilot a dedicated on-street bike path or distinctly colored (green) bike lanes along Industrial Way, and remaining streets to be determined, to connect these two sites so that biking is a realistic and inviting alternative to driving or relying on costly shuttles to bridge the less than one-mile distance between these two sites. This enhancement would entail changes to Figures 14 and 16 (pgs 54 and 56) and Appendix A (pgs. A-2, A-6, A-12, and A-14).	C/CAG to discuss with Health Systems, Added to Open Item Status Report.
34.7	5/4/2011	Jean Fraser, County of San Mateo Health System	Release the revised plan for an additional round of public review and extend the timeline accordingly	We have responded to the request for additional time for review. We've slowed the schedule down from that proposed in February, and held the plan open for review until May 15th. We have received over 155 individual comments from 44 different groups. We met with the advocate group representatives in June to discuss proposed response to comments before making changes to the
35	5/12/2011	MidCoast Community Council (mcc.sanmateo.org) - Len Erickson, Bill Kehoe, Sabrina Brennan	Received 5/12/2011 35 MCC-CCAG-Input-5-11-2011.pdf; 35 Midcoast-CCAG-CBPP-5-11-2011.pdf 35 Harbor District Coastal Trail Letter.pdf Incorporate improvements identified in "Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Study" Incorporate California Coastal Trail – San Mateo County Midcoast - Mirada Surf to Pillar Point) – Approved Incorporate California Coastal Trail North (Pillar Point to Devil's Slide) – Draft under review Incorporate intersection improvements and trails identified in white paper for CBPP.	Included proposed overcrossings and other improvements as recommended in the Highway 1 Safety Improvement Plan. Confirmed and added California Coastal Trail alignment and related intersection improvements.
36	5/17/2011	Sierra Club - Michael J. Ferreira	See attached letter "DraftSCLPCI-CCAG 5-17-2011.doc" 1. Route 1 pedestrian/bike trail from Montara through Half Moon Bay (San Mateo County, Half Moon Bay) – as it is described on page 14 of the Transportation Authority's "Strategic Plan 2009 – 2013" – has apparently been downgraded from a Class I - Multi-use Path to a Class III – Bicycle Route (page 55, Figure 15 in the CCAG Draft). 2. There also appear to be significant portions of already planned – and even already built – trails that are missing from the various maps. (HMB Parallel trail; trail from main street to spanishtown 3. Add planned & existing trails to midcoast: Pillar Ridge and Fitzgerald Marine Reserve are the most obvious. 4. The second half of the Midcoast Mobility Study is currently being drafted and it is expected by recent charette participants that this draft will correct some misclassifications/omissions similar to the ones cited above that populate the first half of the Study. bulk of the funding needs for these missing and/or misclassified trails is also missing from the	1. Maps in Chapter 5 and Appendix A already identify a Class I Bike Path along Highway 1. This comment may relate to the fact that it's identified as Tier 3 priority. In revisions we have not upgraded the priority, but have identified the Highway 1 Corridor (including Parallel Trail) and Coastal Trail as a high priority corridor. 2-4. We have received updated materials from Midcoast Community Council, San Mateo County, and HMB and have updated the maps and tables accordingly. Funding needs reflect these pathways.

Comments on the Draft CBPP

No.	Date	From	Comment	Response
37	4/06/87	Kirsten Keith, City of Menlo Park	<p>Menlo Park has secured \$3.7M from Stanford to mitigate impacts of the Stanford Hospital Expansion. This presents an opportunity for the City to support Stanford's efforts to increase bicycle commuting to the hospital and the main campus from the north, primarily from the Alameda de las Pulgas corridor.</p> <p>The Draft Countywide Bicycle Plan is currently under review. The designation of Alameda de Las Pulgas as a Priority North-South Route in the Draft Plan would be a useful first step in making needed safety improvements to the Santa Cruz/Alameda roadway between Sand Hill Road and Avy Avenue. Menlo Park and San Mateo County share the jurisdiction of this area. I urge the C/CAG to support the designation of the Alameda as a Priority N-S Route in collaboration between San Mateo County, Menlo Park and Stanford. This would affirm the vision of improved</p>	Alameda De Las Pulgas has been added as a priority corridor.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 25, 2011
To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
From: John Hoang
Subject: Review and Recommendation on Improvements to the Call for Projects for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the BPAC review the project application and scoring process from the recently completed Call for Project cycle and recommend improvements to be considered for implementation in the next funding cycle.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact to C/CAG.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

- TDA Article 3 funds are derived from the following sources:
 - Local Transportation Funds (LTF), derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
 - State Transit Assistance fund (STA), derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

C/CAG and the TA recently performed a Joint Call for Projects (CFP) for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for the FY 2012 and FY 2013 cycle. The BPAC completed the project evaluation process resulting in a project prioritization list. Independently, the TA Panel also prioritized the projects. A process to reconcile these two priority lists resulted in the final list of recommended projects to be awarded funding.

In an effort to improve future CFP project application, evaluation and scoring process to assure that the best projects are selected for funding, it is recommended that the BPAC review the recent application and scoring sheet and identify areas for improvements and refinements to be considered in the next cycle.

ATTACHMENTS

- CFP Application
- CFP Scoring Sheet

**JOINT CALL FOR PROJECTS
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (SMCTA)
AND
MEASURE A AND CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
(C/CAG) TDA ARTICLE 3

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2012 and/or 2013 APPLICATION**

I. PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST

- a. AGENCY / SPONSOR:
- b. PROJECT NAME:
- c. PREFERENCE OF FUNDS: ☐ SMCTA ☐ TDA ARTICLE 3 (C/CAG)
☐ No Preference
- d. TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED: \$
- e. APPLICATION CHECKLIST:
☐ Project Location Map (Question III(a))
☐ Policy Consistency Documentation (Question V(a))
☐ Letters of Support (Question VII(c))
-

Fill out all questions in the application. You may refer to the Instructions and Guidance Document for further explanation.

II. PROJECT SCREENING / BASIC ELIGIBILITY

- a. Is the Project Sponsor San Mateo County or a City in San Mateo County?
Answer must be "Yes" to continue. Yes ☐ No ☐
- b. Does design meet Caltrans Standards? Yes or N/A ☐ No ☐
- c. CEQA approval? Yes or N/A ☐ No ☐

Note: CEQA document must be submitted with the application (required for TDA Article 3 funding).

III. General Project Information

a. Project Description

1. Describe the project (location, length, scope, size of project); please include a map:
Explain:

Is a map included?

Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Comment on the status of design of the project, and indicate the percentage of design completed.

b. Project Schedule

Indicate the anticipated beginning and end date for each phase of the project. If a phase has been completed or is not applicable for this application, write "N/A".

Phase	Month and Year	
	Phase Start	Phase End
Pre-project Planning		
Environmental/Preliminary Engineering		
Engineering/Design		
ROW Acquisition and Utilities		
Construction and Procurement		

c. Permitting, Agreements and Environmental Clearance

1. ROW certification completed? Yes or N/A ☐ No ☐

Comments:

2. Permits, Agreements and/or Environmental Clearance approved?

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

List all permits, agreements and environmental clearance (both CEQA and NEPA) approved and/or needed, to date:

Permit/Agreements/Environmental Clearance	Status; Date Approved

Comments:

IV. PROJECT NEED

a. Does the project meet commuter and/or recreational purposes?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Explain:

b. Is bicycle and/or pedestrian safety improved because of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Explain:

V. POLICY CONSISTENCY

- a. Demonstrate the project is consistent with policy documents. List each document or policy, the publication date and the page upon which the project can be found. Attach relevant pages. See Instruction and Guidance Document for a list of example documents.

Document or Policy	Publication Date	Page

VI. STATE OF READINESS

- a. Discuss the public planning process that resulted in project development:

Explain:

- b. Is project identified in the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan as part of the Countywide Bikeway Network or located in a Pedestrian Focus Area identified in the CBPP?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Is project identified in local Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan? Yes ☐ No ☐

Page number:

- c. Comment on level of support. As appropriate, attach documents of support and show composition of relevant committee. (*examples: letters, meeting minutes, etc*)

Explain:

- d. Discuss any potential funding shortfalls or funding sources that are considered risky, and how they will be addressed.

Explain:

e. Can the project be partially funded? Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", how much?

Explain:

f. Can the project be divided into phases? Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", describe the different phases and cost associated with each phase.

Explain:

VII. EFFECTIVENESS

a. What is the relationship of the project to bicycle or pedestrian routes/facilities (i.e. does it provide access to, or close a gap in the bicycle or pedestrian network)?

Explain:

b. Does the project provide access to bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities in high use activity centers (schools, transit stations and other activity centers)?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Explain:

c. Using the table below, indicate the sources of funding as well as the percentage that is either planned, programmed or allocated. Add rows as needed.

Funding Source	Status (Planned, Programmed, Allocated)	Total	Percentage
		\$	%
		\$	%
		\$	%
		\$	%
Total		\$	%

Preference will be given to projects with at least 50% matching funds available.

d. Funds requested: \$

Matching Funds to be provided: \$

Total Project costs \$

Local match percentage = $\frac{\text{Other Matching Funds provided}}{\text{Total Project Cost}}$

= = %

VIII. SUSTAINABILITY

- a. What are the environmental benefits of the project (i.e. preserving open space, reducing emissions and improving air quality)?

Explain:

- b. Does the project provide or improve facilities to or at Transit Oriented Development (TOD)?

Explain:

- c. Does the project support economic development (i.e. create jobs or support jobs and housing growth)?

Explain:

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION

Primary Contact Person:

Telephone Number:

Email address:

Secondary Contact Person:

Telephone Number:

Email address:

**Fiscal Years 2012 and/or 2013
San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Sales Tax Program and/or
TDA Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Program**

Non-Supplantation of Funds Certification

This certification, which is a required component of the sponsor's grant application, affirms that San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A and/or TDA Article 3 Bicycle Pedestrian Program funds will be used to supplement (add to) existing funds, and will not supplant (replace) existing funds that have been appropriated for the same purpose. Potential supplantation will be examined in the application review as well as in the pre-award review and post award monitoring.

Funding may be suspended or terminated for filing a false certification in this application or other reports or documents as part of this program.

Certification Statement:

I certify that any funds awarded under the FY2012 and/or FY2013 San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A and/or the TDA Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Program will be used to supplement existing funds for program activities, and will not replace existing funds or resources.

Project Name: _____

Sponsor: _____

PRINT NAME

TITLE*

SIGNATURE

DATE

* This certification shall be signed by the Executive Director, Chief Executive Officer, President or other such top-ranking official of the Sponsor's organization

JOINT CALL FOR PROJECTS
SMCTA MEASURE A AND C/CAG TDA ARTICLE 3
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2012 and/or 2013 SCORING SHEET

I. PROJECT NAME AND FUNDING REQUEST			
a. AGENCY / SPONSOR:		RATER:	
b. PROJECT NAME:			
c. FUNDING PREFERENCE: <input type="checkbox"/> SMCTA <input type="checkbox"/> TDA ARTICLE 3 (C/CAG) <input type="checkbox"/> No Preference			
d. TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED:			

II. PROJECT SCREENING / BASIC ELIGIBILITY			
a. Project Sponsor is San Mateo Co. or City	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> (No disqualifies project)		
b. Design meets CALTRANS standards?	Yes or N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> ("No" disqualifies project)		
c. CEQA approval	Yes or N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No* <input type="checkbox"/> ("No" Disqualifies project for TDA Article 3 funding)		
Evaluation Criteria (Parts II – IV)	Scale	Max Points	Points Assigned

III. GENERAL INFORMATION			
Clear and complete proposal	0 or 4 (A zero score disqualifies project.)	4	
c(1). Right-of-Way Certification complete	0 – No 3 – Yes (Completed or N/A)	3	
c(2). Permits, Agreements and/or Environmental Clearance obtained?	0 – No 3 – Yes (or N/A)	3	
Subtotal		10	

IV. PROJECT NEED			
a. Does the project meet commuter and/or recreational purpose?	0 - No 10 - Yes	10	
b. Improves Safety	0 -None 3 - Little 5 - Moderate 7 – Substantial 10 - Significant	10	
Subtotal		20	

V. POLICY CONSISTENCY			
a. Is the project consistent with approved policy documents?	0 - None 5 - Moderate 10 - Significant	10	
Subtotal		10	

VI. STATE OF READINESS			
a. Project is a result of a public planning process?	0 - No 3 - Yes	3	
b. Part of the Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan's (CBPP) Countywide Bikeway Network, located in a Pedestrian Focus Area identified in the CBPP, or identified in a local Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan?	0 - None 4 - Local Project 7 - C/CAG Project	7	
c. Is there demonstrated local support; letters attached?	0 - None 2 - Little 5 - Moderate 7 - Strong	7	
d - f. Is a plan for funding shortfall identified, including partial funding or phasing?	0 - No 3 - Yes	3	
Subtotal		20	
VII. EFFECTIVENESS			
a. How well does the proposed project complement the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	0 - Does Not 5 - Moderately 10 - Substantially	10	
b. Does the project provide access to bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities in high use activity centers?	0 - No 10 - Yes	10	
c & d. Leveraging of funds (Local Match as % of total requested funds)	0 - 0% match 2 - 10% match 4 - 20% match 6 - 30% match 8 - 40% match 10 - 50% match	10	
Subtotal		30	
VIII. SUSTAINABILITY			
a. Does the project provide an environmental benefit?	0 -No 3 - Yes	3	
b. Does the project provide or improve facilities to or at TOD?	0 - No 4 - Yes	4	
c. Does the project support economic development?	0 -No 3 - Yes	3	
Subtotal		10	
TOTAL SCORE		100	